



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

But this is the rule only where there is no domestic administrator, or he is appointed after the debt is paid, or at least after suit is brought by the domiciliary administrator. *Wilkins v. Ellet*, 108 U. S. 256, 2 Sup. Ct 641, 27 L. Ed. 718; *Bull v. Fuller*, 78 Ia. 20, 42 N. W. Rep. 572, 16 Am. St. Rep. 419; *National Bank v. Sharp*, 53 Md. 521; *Greenwalt v. Bastian*, 10 Kan. App. 101, 61 P. Rep. 513; *Thorman v. Broderick*, 52 La. Ann. 1298, 27 So. Rep. 735. Where there is a domestic administrator payment to a foreign administrator according to the following cases is no discharge. *Equitable Life Assurance Soc. v. Vogel*, 76 Ala. 441, 52 Am. Rep. 344; *Walker v. Welker*, 55 Ill. App. 118; *Amsden v. Danielson*, 18 R. I. 787, 35 A. Rep. 70; *Murphy v. Crouse*, 135 Cal. 14, 66 P. Rep. 971; and *Stone v. Scripture*, 4 Lans. (N. Y.) 186. This last case is directly in point, from the same state as the principal case, is decided just the other way, cites authorities and gives the following reason for its action,—“an administrator having been appointed in this state who was authorized to receive and discharge the mortgage, the foreign administrator had no lawful right to discharge it.” In the principal case the domestic administrator did nothing until after the bank had paid the debt, and the court seemed to reason from the equities of the case that his delay in acting put him in the same position as if he had not been appointed until after the debt was paid, although the court does not say so. The court proceeds to say that the appointment being of record in the surrogate’s office was no notice because to make it such would be embarrassing to creditors. Aside from the question of notice which was not considered by the cases above enumerated, the fact that the opinion cites absolutely no authorities to support it on the point in dispute and that authorities to the contrary are numerous leads us to doubt the correctness of the decision.

HIGHWAY—LICENSE—DEFECTIVE BRIDGE—LIABILITY OF OWNER.—Several years prior to April, 1902, the public had been permitted to travel over land belonging to the defendant without objection on its part. On the day named the plaintiff was riding his mule over the land, and coming to a bridge which had been built over a small bayou, he started to cross upon the bridge, but it careened, having been negligently constructed, thus throwing mule and rider into the bayou, injuring both severely. In this action brought to recover for his injuries, also for the price of his mule, *Held*, plaintiff could recover. *Lawson v. Shreveport Waterworks Company* (1903), —La. —, 35 So. Rep. 390.

The main question in this case is what duty did the company owe to persons traveling over this land? The public were given an implied invitation to use this way, and the licensor assumes the obligation of seeing that the premises are in a reasonably safe condition. *COOLEY ON TORTS*, 604-607; *Bennett v. R. R. Co.*, 102 U. S. 577. If plaintiff had been traveling over this land, having business with the owner, there is no doubt that defendant would have been liable in this action; but he was simply passing along the way by permission, and the following authorities hold that no duty was owed by the defendant to see that the bridge was in a reasonably safe condition: *Carleton v. Franconia Iron and Steel Co.*, 99 Mass. 216; *Sweeney v. R. R. Co.*, 10 Allen (Mass.) 368; *R. R. Co. v. Bingham*, 29 Ohio St. 364; *Hounsell v. Smith*, 7 C. B. N. S. 731; *Gillis v. R. R. Co.*, 59 Pa. 129: *WHARTON ON NEGLIGENCE*, §§ 821-822.

HUSBAND AND WIFE—BILLS AND NOTES—INTERMARRIAGE OF PARTIES.—Defendant in this suit gave his promissory note to Rosa B. Shepardson for money she had loaned him. A few months afterward the parties were married and that relation has existed ever since. The note in suit belongs to the wife, demand had been made and note was overdue when this suit was